

### **REMARKS**

Prior to this Amendment and Response, original claims 1-37 were pending in the Application. Herein, claims 1, 12, 23, and 34 are amended; claims 19, 31, and 36-37 are canceled, and claims 38-41 have been added. Therefore, upon entry of the Amendment, claims 1-18, 20-30, 32-35, and 38-41 will remain pending in the Application. Entry of this Amendment, reconsideration, and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Objections**

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 34 because it recites “alert the held desk”, suggesting that it should properly be “alert the help desk”. The Examiner is correct, and claim 34 has been amended to correct this typographical error.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102**

In paragraphs 3 thorough 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by *Jones et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,219,648). Applicants respectfully traverse. The present invention is directed to a method, system, and computer program product for monitoring service tickets for information technology service providers to ensure quality of service, and includes inspecting service tickets to determine a deadline, determining a deadline approaching alert time - before the deadline - at which a help desk user must be notified that the deadline must be met, and alerting the help desk user that the deadline is approaching when the deadline approaching alert time has been reached. In contrast,

*Jones* teaches sending a notification only after a deadline (“predefined time interval”) has been reached (*see, Jones* at col. 5, lines 43-46). In addition, *Jones* also fails to teach or suggest notifying the help desk user that the deadline for resolving the problem associated with a service ticket must be met (*see, Jones* at col. 5, lines 51-60). The likely reason for this, of course, is that the deadline has already past. *Jones* is directed only to remedial measures, while the present invention is directed to meeting levels of service associated with response time as well. While it is understood that the system of *Jones* may be modified to reach the present invention, that suggestion comes only from the present Application.

Nevertheless, independent claims 1, 12, and 23 have been amended to add an additional feature that is also not found in the cited references, namely that the present invention also includes displaying, or causing to be displayed, on a display device associated with the help desk, a graphical representation of service tickets that have reached a predetermined percentage of the time before their due date. Note that this could include all assigned service tickets, depending on the selected percentage. In a preferred embodiment, it includes those service tickets for which 75% of the time before the deadline according to an LOS has expired, and the display may be minimized to allow help desk agents to work on other activities using the display device.

Support for this amendment is found, for example, in the Application at page 8, lines 7-15. This feature is not found in *Jones*, which does not teach or suggest displaying the service tickets in the recited manner. *Jones* does mention, in passing, that notifications that deadlines have been past may be accomplished using an X-window terminal display message (col. 5, lines 51-53). Displaying such an X-window terminal display message, however, is clearly not the

same as providing for the user a display, preferably in grid form, of the service tickets that have been assigned to that help desk, or in one embodiment those requiring the most urgent attention. (It is also not taught or suggested in *Riley*, which does not deal at all with display characteristics.)

Independent claim 34 has been amended to correct a typographical error, as noted above, but already recites displaying active tickets to a help desk user, which, as described above, is not taught or suggested by the cited references.

In light of the amendments and reasons provided above, Applicant respectfully suggests that this ground for rejection has been overcome.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103**

In paragraphs 9 through 23 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-11, 13-22, 24-33, and 36-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Jones et al.* in view of *Riley et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/012398 A1). In response, Applicant states that claims 2-11, 13-18, 20-22, 24-30, 32-33, and 35, as well as new claims 38-41, each depend directly or indirectly from a respective one of independent claims 1, 12, 23, or 34, and for the reasons provided above are distinguishable from the cited references at least by virtue of their dependency (claims 19, 31, and 36-37 having been canceled).

For this reason, Applicant respectfully suggests that this ground for rejection has also been overcome.

Application No. 10/615,054  
Amendment dated June 21, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of March 21, 2008

In light of the foregoing, the pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, examination and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Robert H. Kelly /

---

Robert H. Kelly  
Reg. No. 33,922

KELLY & KRAUSE, L.P.  
6600 LBJ Freeway, Suite 275  
Dallas, Texas 75240  
Telephone: (214) 446-6684  
Fax: (214) 446-6692  
[robert.kelly@kelly-krause.com](mailto:robert.kelly@kelly-krause.com)